

REMARKS

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action the Examiner has rejected Claims 7-11 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sargent *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,234,466). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration and withdrawal thereof.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is taking inconsistent positions in rejecting the claims in paragraph 2 of the Office Action and in addressing Applicants' argument in paragraph 4 of the Office Action. If Sargent is not limited to bleaching solutions and includes the treatment of any process stream where acid has been traditionally used, as alleged by the Examiner in paragraph four of the Office Action, then this application should be entitled to benefit of the filing date of the Sargent *et al.* patent by virtue of the priority claim.

If Applicants are not entitled to the benefit of the priority claim to Sargent *et al.*, then the Examiner should admit that the teachings in Sargent *et al.* are not sufficient to reject the claims over the Sargent *et al.* reference alone. In either case, the Examiner's rejection is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lindstrom *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,911,790) in view of Sargent *et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration and withdrawal thereof.

Applicants again respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Lindstrom with those of Sargent *et al.* As the Examiner recognizes, Lindstrom is limited to the disclosure of the use of alum in paper making processes. Even if one assumes, *arguendo*,

U.S.S.N. 09/255,222
FILING DATE: February 22, 1999
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

that Sargent *et al.* teaches adjusting the pH of paper manufacturing streams with urea sulfate, there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute urea sulfate for alum in the process of Lindstrom, absent a hindsight reconstruction of Applicants' invention using the present claims as a template. Again, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for immediate allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or believes any issues remain to be resolved, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (404) 815-6218 to schedule a telephonic interview to discuss the same prior to the issuance of a final office action.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Order Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce D. Gray
Reg. No. 35,799

OF COUNSEL:

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, GA 30309-4530
(404) 815-6218
Attorney Docket No.: P2160/187847